

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy of a telephone interview on January 10, 2008, with Applicants' representative, Eric King, during which the amendments presently set forth and Applicants' reasoning as to why the presently amended claims clearly distinguish over the reference cited by the Examiner were discussed. Applicants respectfully submit that the substance of the interview is set forth in the following remarks.

As discussed in the interview, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17, to further clarify embodiments of the invention. During the interview, the Examiner concurred with Applicants that amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are distinguishable over the prior art cited in the previous Office Action.

Reconsideration in light of the amendments, the interview, and the remarks made herein, is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-19, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,867,226 issued to Wehmeyer et al. (hereinafter Wehmeyer) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,379 issued to Knudson et al. (hereinafter Knudson) and even further in view U.S. Patent No. 6,020,930 issued to Legrand (hereinafter Legrand).

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to further clarify embodiments of the invention. In particular, amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 include limitations generally directed to: ... displaying an arrangement of a plurality of different *channel icons associated with respective video program providers in a plurality of rows and columns simultaneously on the display device*...displaying a pop-up for a selected channel icon on the display device while still displaying the arrangement of a plurality of different channel icons...*the pop-up overlaying at least one other channel icon*... wherein the pop-up displays first program data associated with a first program of

the selected channel icon in response to first input...and *the pop-up displays second program data associated with a second program of the selected channel icon in response to second input while the arrangement of the plurality of different channel icons in the plurality of rows and columns is still displayed and the pop-up continues to overlay the at least one channel icon.*

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are not rendered obvious by Wehmeyer in view of Knudson and even further in view of Legrand because these references, alone, or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claim limitations set forth in these amended claims.

For example, Wehmeyer teaches a set-top box and a program guide. The program guide of Wehmeyer includes a singular column of channel identifiers and associated program listings (see Figure 1 of Wehmeyer). Wehmeyer further teaches an auxiliary text display 120 that provides additional data relating to a highlighted television program (see Figure 1, column 2, lines 28-32). The auxiliary text display 120 is shown only to overlay the program listing columns. The conventional program guide appears to occupy almost the whole of the screen and no video appears to be shown such that numerous program listings can be displayed to the user.

In contrast, with reference to Figures 4 and 5 of Knudson, as relied upon by the Office Action, Knudson teaches a single browse display 70 that is provided as an overlay on the screen, near the bottom of the screen, so that a viewer can watch video while cycling through the channel program data contained in the overlay for the current channel or different channels.

As shown in Figure 4 of Knudson and as described at column 6, lines 26-63 of Knudson:

A conventional program guide browse display arrangement is shown in FIG. 4. Video for the current channel to which the user's set-top box is tuned (i.e., the current channel that the user is viewing) is displayed on the user's television screen 68. When the user presses a remote control cursor key, browse display 70 is provided as an overlay on top of screen 68. Initially, browse display 70 contains program listings information for the current channel and time (e.g., channel 6 and 10:30 AM), as shown on the upper screen in FIG. 4. If the user presses a cursor key, the video for

the current channel that is displayed on screen 68 is not changed, but the program listings information in browse display 70 is changed to the next available channel (e.g., channel 7), as shown on the lower screen in FIG 4. As indicated by arrows 72, the user may use cursor keys to browse program listing for various other channels and times without disturbing the video for the current channel that is displayed on screen 68. (Emphasis added).

Because Knudson is clearly directed toward showing video with only a single browse display located at the bottom of the screen so as not to obscure the video presently being watched, Knudson actually teaches away from a combination with Wehmeyer.

As to Legrand, Figure 7 of Legrand and the associated text of Legrand merely disclose a video picture program guide 702 that displays nine still video pictures 704-720 associated with respective channels.

There is quite simply no teaching or suggestion in the Wehmeyer, Knudson, and Legrand references of: channel icons, channel icons displayed and arranged in a plurality of different rows and columns, or a pop-up for a selected channel icon that occurs while still displaying the arrangement of channel icons that overlays at least one other channel icon...wherein the pop-up displays first and second program data (responsive to user input) while the arrangement of the plurality of different channel icons in the plurality of rows and columns continues to be displayed and the pop-up continues to overlay the at least one other channel icon.

Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are quite simply not taught or suggested by the combination of Wehmeyer, Knudson, and Legrand.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wehmeyer, Knudson, and Legrand, and the other references of record, either alone, or in combination, do not render obvious the amended claim limitations of Applicants' amended independent claims 1, 9 and 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17, as well as the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and should be passed to issuance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-24 are allowable over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. is hereby made.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1209.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2008

By: /Stacey A. Mollohan/
Stacey A. Mollohan, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,257

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
20511 Lake Forest Drive
Lake Forest, CA 92630
Tel.: (949) 672-7000
Fax: (949) 672-6604